fusion in all the departments of legal knowledge in passing from one to the other. They never could be united in one department of legal learning. The judges could not, if thus obliged to attend to all classes of cases, properly discharge the duties confided to them by the vote of the people.

My colleague (Mr. Brent) has said the appellate jurisdiction of the city of Baltimore had for years past occupied almost exclusively the attention of Judge Purviance, until that docket has reached nearly a thousand cases. We propose to add that to the jurisdiction of the Court of Common Pleas, for the trial of cases under $500, and to have a Superior Court for the trial of cases above $500. There is an apprehension of a failure of jurisdiction, and that parties may be turned out of court. The proviso to be connected with the 12th section is taken verbatim from the act of Congress of 1789, commonly called the Judiciary Act, and has been for some sixty years the subject of judicial construction, and yet the gentleman from Anne Arundel has ventured to pronounce it a novelty. We desire to distinguish between these courts by broad lines of demarcation, so that every man may know the forum to which he must resort for appropriate relief.

We wish to have the jurisdiction so divided that every man having a claim may know where to go for redress. The plan of the gentleman has already been tried. It was an experiment, but it has gone beyond experiment, and we now speak from experience. There is not a man in Baltimore, even in the humblest walks of life, who does not feel the burden of the existing system, and who does not wish to be relieved; and we are met here, in a great measure, to give that relief. In the course of the very short canvass which I had before the people—for I was not only a candidate without solicitation, but against my earnest solicitation,—I never said but one word with regard to this Reform Convention. That was upon the night before the election, when I addressed the people and said that there was one point upon which I desired to speak frankly, and to ascertain their wishes; and that was with regard to a change in the judiciary system.

During the many years that I had advocated, not only the expediency but the necessity of reform, I had so fully developed all my opinions upon the prominent topics then under discussion, that it would be more than a twice told tale again to declare the principles which had so often been avowed, but that as the important change now contemplated in the judiciary system had not been presented so distinctly, as it was now brought to the public notice, I felt myself bound to announce that I was in favor of thorough and radical reform in that department of the government. The response from the assembled multitude manifested their concurrence in that opinion, and I feel myself acting under the pledge thus given when I vindicate the system we propose.

Mr. Brown moved to reconsider the vote of the Convention on the amendment offered by Mr. Morgan to the 13th section of the report, and adopted by the Convention, striking out the first paragraph of said section.

Mr. Brown. I have no doubt that in the preparation of this bill, some of the most experienced and talented men of the bar of Baltimore have been consulted, and surely they ought to know what kind of courts will suit them best. I understand that there is no increase of judges. If the Convention should think proper to make an increase of salary in consequence of the very heavy duties to be performed, that will happen in reference to any plan. The proposition in the bill is to create just such courts as the people interested in them desire. I cannot see why any portion of the State should object, when it does not subject your treasury to any greater expense. Why can we not permit them to arrange it for themselves? It appears to me that we ought to do so. The same amount goes out of the treasury to pay these men in either case; and that is all in which we are interested. I should think it was treating them unkindly not to give them what they ask for. If they choose to separate their equity from their common-law business, they know what they require. If the gentlemen from Baltimore city do not wish the motion pressed now, I will withdraw it, and make the motion to-morrow.

Mr. Stewart, of Baltimore. I see no objection to considering it now.

Mr. Brown. Then I do not withdraw the motion to reconsider.

Mr. Morgan. I move to postpone indefinitely, for the purpose of making a few remarks. The gentleman from Carroll (Mr. Brown) has said that this did not save the treasury one cent, the number of judges being the same. The same in your new system as in the old system? The same as they are now? But does not this plan, adopted by the Convention, propose to change the judiciary system as it is now, and to give us one judge to preside over the district or circuit courts, and to carry that change also into Baltimore city? It is a plain question, to be brought before the minds of this Convention, whether or not the members of this Convention are to abolish the jurisdiction of the court of chancery in the whole State, for the purpose of transferring it to the city of Baltimore, while their constituents are turned from the bar of that chancery court. Does the gentleman propose to diminish the expense of it? The gentleman from Carroll, who now seeks to revive the 13th section, and who voted to give Baltimore city this Chancellor, did not propose that that Chancellor should have less than $2,500. It amounts to this. You have made the issue at home, and have come here upon that issue, to abolish the chancery court; and now you propose merely to transfer it to the city of Baltimore, taking away from your own people the right to go into that court.

Mr. Brown. I voted against abolishing the High Court of Chancery.

Mr. Morgan. I know you did. The gentleman is more consistent than some others upon that point; more so, certainly, than the mag-